

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections of record from the December 24, 2003 *Office Action*.

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-33 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 11-27, 32 and 33 stand rejected. Claim 11 is amended.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-10 and 28-31 are allowed.

**Claim Rejections**

The Examiner has rejected: (1) claims 11, 12, 14-22, 24-27, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *JP 2002-062842* (hereinafter “*JP ‘842*”); and (2) claims 13 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *JP ‘842* in view of *JP 2000-81593* (hereinafter “*JP ‘593*”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**Independent Claim 11**

The Examiner takes the position that *JP ‘842* discloses all of the features of independent claim 11.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that *JP ‘842* fails to teach or suggest “detecting a projection display area from the image imaged by said image sensor.” Rather, *JP ‘842* discloses a display image correction apparatus (camera 4, projector 1, screen position detecting portion 5, and projector image creation portion 2) which corrects a display image by conversion

of a spatial coordinate system of the camera and the screen (pars. 0056-0076). To do so, the size of a screen must be known to solve the conversion equation of the coordinate system (par. 0059).

Clearly, this spatial coordinate based system does not have any correspondence to the claimed detection of a projection display area.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 11 is patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 12-20 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 21

The Examiner takes the position that *JP '842* discloses all of the features of independent claim 21.

In contrast, Applicants respectfully submit that *JP '842* fails to teach or suggest the “means for calculating a distance between a plurality of points inside the projected image and said projector from the image imaged by said image sensor.” Rather, as discussed above, *JP '842* utilizes a spatial coordinate system, which includes a camera or a three dimensional position sensor (*i.e.*, a transmitter) using radio waves, ultrasonic waves, or a magnetic field to measure distance between the projector and the screen (par. 0093). While this system measures the position of the screen, there is no teaching or suggestion that it can determine distances between points inside the projected image.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 21 is patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 22-27, 32 and 33 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Dependent Claims 13 and 23

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 12-20, 22-27, 32 and 33 are also separately patentable over the applied references, at least because of the features recited in the respective claims.

For example, regarding dependent claims 13 and 23, the Examiner takes the position that *JP '842* discloses many of the features of these claims, but fails to teach or suggest “detecting the image through the projection lens.” Applicants agree that *JP '842* is deficient, at least in this regard.

In an attempt to show that such features were known, the Examiner applies *JP '593*, alleging that “it was known to detect the image (via 13) through the projection lens 4” (O.A., pg. 3). However, element 13 in *JP '593* is a display device, not an imaging device. Thus, the Examiner is incorrect, and the rejection is unsupported.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-33 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-33.


If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/621,366

Attorney Docket # Q76549

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy P. Cremen  
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 16, 2004